

VIA FACSIMILE AND FIRST CLASS MAIL

Neil Reiff, Esq.
Sandler, Reiff & Young, P.C.
300 M St. SE, Suite 1102
Washington, DC 20003
Facsimile: (202) 479-1115

DEC 0 8 2010

RE:

MUR 6257

John Callahan, et al.

Dear Mr. Reiff:

On March 3, 2010, the Federal Election Commission (the "Commission") notified your clients of a complaint alleging that they violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"), and provided a copy of the complaint to your clients.

After reviewing the aliegations contained in the complaint, your clients' response, and publicly annihible information, the Commission, on October 19, 2010, found remain to believe that John Callahan, Friends of John Callahan and John V. Filipos, in his official capacity as treasurer, and John Callahan for Congress and John V. Filipos, in his official capacity as treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C. § 441i(e) and 11 C.F.R. § 110.3(d), provisions of the Act and the Commission's regulations. In addition, the Commission found reason to believe that John Callahan for Congress and John V. Filipos, in his official capacity as treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C.§ 434(b)(3) and (4). Enclosed is the Factual and Legal Analysis that sets forth the basis for the Commission's determination.

Please note that you have a legal obligation to preserve all documents, records and materials relating to this matter until such thate as you are notified that the Cummission less closed its file in this matter. See 18 U.S.C. § 1519.

Pa	JR 6257 (Cailanan, <i>et al</i>.) ge 2		
	·		

On behalf of the Commission,

Matthew S. Petersen Chairman

Enclosures
Factual and Legal Analysis

25

26

27

1 2	FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION				
3	FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS				
5 6 7 8 9 10	RESPONDENTS: John Callahan MUR: 6257 John Callahan for Congress and John V. Filipos, in his official capacity as treasurer Friends of John Callahan and John V. Filipos, in his official capacity as treasurer				
12	I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>				
13	This matter was generated by a complaint filed with the Federal Election Commission by				
14	Robert A. Gleason, Ir., alleging violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as				
15	amended (the "Act"), by John Callahan, Friends of John Callahan and John V. Filipos, in his				
16	official capacity as treasurer, ("Mayoral Committee") and John Callahan for Congress and John				
17	V. Filipos, in his official capacity as treasurer ("Federal Committee").				
18	In 2009, John Callahan was simultaneously an unopposed candidate for mayor of				
19	Bethlehem, Pennsylvania and a federal candidate for Pennsylvania's 15 th Congressional District.				
20	The complaint in this matter alleges that Callahan's mayoral campaign paid for research used to				
21	determine the feasibility of Callahan running for Congress. Callahan's mayoral committee,				
22	Friends of John Callahan and John V. Filipos, in his official capacity as treasumer, ("Mayoral				
23	Committee") made two payments totaling \$9,932 to vandor Stanford Campaigns, the first on				
24	May 6, 2009 for \$4,500 and the second on June 22, 2009, for opposition self-research. The				

complaint alleges that the research was for the purpose of "testing the waters" in connection with

a possible federal candidacy, and therefore constituted an impermissible in-kind contribution to

John Callahan and Callahan for Congress and John V. Filipos, in his official capacity as treasurer

According to their website, Stariford Research, an entity in Austin, Texas, performs a wide variety of campaign-related services, including opposition research, for various organizations, including local, state and Federal candidates. http://www.oppresearch.com.

MUR 6257 (Callahan) Factual and Legal Analysis Page 2 of 6

- 1 ("Federal Committee"). Complaint at 3. The complaint further alleges that the Federal
- 2 Committee did not disclose the contribution.
- The Respondents deny that the research was "testing the waters" activity related to
- 4 Callahan's federal candidacy. Instead, they state that the research commissioned by the Mayoral
- 5 Committee had "inherent value" and was "procured, and originally used" by Callahan's mayoral
- 6 campaign, and was therefore properly paid for with funds from the Mayoral Committee.
- 7 Response at 1, 2. The Respondents also state that when the Federal Committee eventually
- 8 utilized the research to further Callahan's federal candidacy in January 2010, it paid the Mayoral
- 9 Committee what it believed to be the fair market value of the research and timely disclosed the
- 10 disbursement. Id at 2.
- Based on the complaint, the response, and other available information, the Commission
- 12 found reason to believe that John Callahan, Friends of John Callahan and John V. Filipos, in his
- official capacity as treasurer, and John Callahan for Congress and John V. Filipos, in his official
- capacity as treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C. § 441i(e) and 11 C.F.R. § 110.3(d), and that John
- 15 Callahan for Congress and John V. Filipos, in his official capacity as treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C.
- 16 § 434(b)(3) and (4).

17

18

II. FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

A. Factual Sammary

- John Callahan is a candidate for the United States House of Representatives for
- 20 Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District. Callahan officially announced his federal candidacy
- 21 on July 27, 2009. He filed his Statement of Candidacy with the Commission on July 31, 2009.
- 22 and his Federal Committee filed its Statement of Organization on the same day. Before that time
- 23 he had made no official statements indicating that he had decided to run and raised no funds for a

MUR 6257 (Callahan)
Factual and Legal Analysis
Page 3 of 6

- 1 Congressional race. ² The Federal Committee timely filed its first disclosure report, the 2009
- 2 October Quarterly Report, on October 15, 2009.
- 3 Callahan is also the current mayor of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. He was first elected to
- 4 the office in November 2003, and ran for and won re-election in 2005 and 2009. See
- 5 http://www.bethlehem-pa.gov/about/mayor. He ran unopposed in the 2005 general election, as
- 6 well as in the May 19, 2009, primary and the November 3, 2009, general election. Id.
- 7 The complaint alleges that disbursements made by Callahan's Mayoud Communities to
- 8 Stanford Campaigns funded "testing the waters" activity related to Callahan's federal candidacy,
- 9 and that "[c]ertainly the results of this research were used in determining whether or not
- 10 Callahan should become a candidate," and therefore constituted an impermissible in-kind
- 11 contribution to the Federal Committee. In support of the allegation, the complaint points to an
- 12 October 22, 2009, article ("Morning Call article") regarding the opposition research tactics of
- 13 Callahan and Representative Charlie Dent, the leading Democratic and Republican candidates
- 14 for the 15th District Congressional seat, respectively. Complaint, Attachment 3. The article
- 15 reports that, "Callahan, before he even announced a run, hired a Democratic research firm to find
- out what criminal background checks in the name John Callahan would dig up, according to
- 17 campaign manager Juntin Schall." Id. The article also states that Callahan was curious to know
- 18 "what a nhack of contractors who had done business with the city would reveal." Id.

Although Callahan declared his candidacy on July 25, 2009, he reportedly "confirmed his interest" in a Federal candidacy as early as June 24, 2009, when he stated that he was "seriously considering a run." See Lynn Olanoff, U.S. Rep. Charlie Dent's Campaign Manager Calls for Bethlehem Mayor John Callahan to Drop his Mayoral bid if he runs for Congress (June 25, 2009), at http://www.lehighvalleylive.com/bethlehem/index.ssf?/base/news-1/12459027875130.xml&coll=3 (last visited August 3, 2010). See also Bill Wichert, Bethlehem Mayor John Callahan announces Congressional Bid, (July 25, 2009), at http://www.lehighvalleylive.nam/bethlehem/index.ssf?2009/07/bethlehem_mayor_jehn_callahan_2.html (Callahan announces his Congressional candidacy).

MUR 6257 (Callahan)
Factual and Legal Analysis
Page 4 of 6

1 Respondents deny that the research was "testing the waters" activity in relation to

2 Callahan's federal candidacy, and instead maintain that it had "inherent value" to the mayoral

3 campaign and therefore was properly paid for with funds from the Mayoral Committee.

4 Response at 2. Respondents also maintain that background self-research, unlike a poll, does not

clearly indicate that a candidate is considering a run for office, but "may be used for a variety of

purposes not related to federal elections." Id. at 3. They also assert that at the time of the

payments, Calinhan had made no decision regarding a possible Congressional ran and was in fact

8 still raising funds for his mayoral election. Id. at 2.

Respondents point out that the Morning Call article does not directly quote Callahan's federal campaign manager, and that he never stated that the research was to benefit the federal campaign, or even to "test the waters" for a possible federal candidacy. Id. at 3. Respondents also state that the federal campaign manager "made clear to the reporter several times that the research had intrinsic value to the ongoing mayoral campaign and therefore had to be paid for with funds from the mayoral campaign committee." Id. In addition, Respondents maintain that the federal campaign manager informed the reporter that "the federal campaign was not using the research but that, when and if the mayoral campaign was over, and a potential federal campaign denitled to utiline the research, the federal campaign to Respondents, the Federal Committee the fair market value for use of the research." Id. According to Respondents, the Federal Committee paid \$5,000 to the Mayoral Committee on January 15, 2010 "for the pro-rated cost to purchase the research," before it used the research. Id. at 4. The Federal Committee reported that \$5,000 payment on its 2010 April Quarterly Report filed with the Commission.

1

MUR 6257 (Callahan)
Factual and Legal Analysis
Page 5 of 6

B. Legal Analysis

2	The Act prohibits a federal candidate, a candidate's agent and entities established,		
3	financed, maintained or controlled by them from soliciting, receiving, directing, transferring or		
4	spending funds in connection with a federal election, unless those funds are subject to the		
5	limitations, prohibitions and reporting requirements of the Act. 2 U.S.C. § 441i(e)(1)(A).		
6	Likewise, transfers of funds or assets from a cundidate's non-Rederal campaign committee or		
7	account to his or her principal ouropaign committee for a federal election are prohibited.		
8	11 C.F.R. § 110.3(d). A candidate's federal campaign committee may, however, purchase		
9	goods and services from its non-federal campaign committee so long as the federal campaign		
10	committee pays the "usual and normal charge" for such goods and services. 2 U.S.C.		
11	§§ 431(8)(A)(i); 441b(b)(2); 11 CFR 100.52(d)(l).		
12	In 2009, the Mayoral Committee paid \$9,932 for opposition self-research by Stanford		
13	Campaigns. On January 15, 2010, the Federal Committee paid the Mayoral Committee \$5,000		
14	for "the pro-rated cost to purchase the research." Response at 3. However, it is unclear on what		
15	basis the Federal Committee calculated its pro-rated share of the research that it purchased. If		
16	the Federal Committee used the entire IIIe that Stanford Campaigns compiled for the Mayoral		
17	Construction in the middle of 2009 for \$9,932, then the \$5,600 that the Federal Committee paid for		
18	the research in Jazuary 2010, may not have been the usual and normal charge for that resnarch,		
19	which would be in violation of the Act and Commission regulations.		
20	Based on the above, the Commission found reason to believe that John Callahan, Friends		
21	of John Callahan and John V. Filipos, in his official capacity as treasurer, and John Callahan for		
22	Congress and John V. Filipos, in his official capacity as treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C. § 441i(e)		
23	and 11 C.F.R. § 110.3(d). The Commission also found reason to believe that John Callahan for		

MUR 6257 (Callahan) Factual and Legal Analysis Page 6 of 6

- 1 Congress and John V. Filipos, in his official capacity as treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C. § 434(b)(3)
- 2 and (4).